20c SEPTEMBER 24, 1951

Gangs Invade the Unions—page 12

New Republic

Revolt in Russia's Satellites?

How far is the resistance against Russia's Communist dictatorship organized? How far can it be organized? How much help can it be given?

by TRIS COFFIN

EUROPE the Battleground

The third in a series of reports by Michael Straight

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

The Riddle of Modern Poetry

● I am wondering if your Editorial Board will display a little charity toward a life-long charter subscriber and reader and give me a little help upon a problem which has been puzzling me during the entire 37 years of the *New Republic's* history, and even some years before that. I am sure that there must be a number of other subscribers and readers who are as hopeless old fogies as I and will be grateful for your help.

The matter is that I am unable to make anything out of what is called modern poetry. It began being modern about 40 years ago, and first I gave up looking for any rhyme, and then I gave up looking for any rhythm, then I gave up looking for any melody, any beauty, any wisdom, and even any sense. I am not asking you to explain any of these things in poetry, because if a person doesn't get them or feel them, he is definitely out of the running. But there is one simple little thing which somebody on your staff may be able to explain to a bewildered world; and that is the way the poets divide their lines so as to make it impossible for anybody to know just what he is reading, or what is coming next, or what should be accented, or just anything at all.

The occasion for this appeal is your issue of August 27, in which you published a review of a book of poems called *Paterson*, by William Carlos Williams. The review is written by "a member of the English Department of Washington Square College, New York University," and it is this gentleman's business to understand poetry. Maybe if you put it up to him kindly and properly he will be the one to take pity upon us old fogies.

He tells us that Mr. Williams is "one of the very few really accomplished poets in English today." He gives us some samples of the writing which justifies this high opinion, and I quote the first line of the extracts he gives us:

> Like a cylindrical tank fresh silvered upended on the sidewalk to advertise some plumber's shop, a profusion.

Now that may be poetry; I don't say it isn't; I am humble and perfectly willing to admit that there may be something wrong with me. I am asking just one simple question, which is, why a line of poetry should start a new clause or a new statement, beginning with an indefinite article and a noun, and then leave the rest of the clause to be carried over as another line of poetry. Surely it would be just as well if the line were to end with the word "shop" and the comma, and give us a chance to get our breath before we start off a new line with "A profusion of pink roses," etc. It seems to me that this isn't a question of poetry, it is a question of the elemental rules of sentence structure, and the physical facts of human lungs and vocal chords. If this were a single instance I wouldn't get excited about it, but it seems to be a rule of these modern poets, and that is what I am asking about.

I take another, and still stranger, example. I quote:

> In Breughel's great picture, the Kermess, the dancers go round, they go round and around, the squeal and the blare and the tweedle of bagpipes, a bugle and fiddles tipping their bellies.

Now printing that as a paragraph, as I have done, and calling it prose, it seems to me rather cute; but the poet chooses to divide it into five lines of poetry, and the basis on which he divides it is what worries me. He takes the phrase "round and around," which seems to me a perfectly definite, familiar phrase that I know how to read, and he ends a line with the word "and," and starts a new line with the word "around"; and then when he comes to the end of that line, behold, the end is "and the." It seems to me that to anybody who has ever written a sentence, to say nothing of a poem, there could be nothing more absurd than to break a phrase like "round and around," or to end a line of poetry with the word "and"; unless possibly it is to end a line of poetry with the words "and the" and then be obliged to shift your eyes back in a hurry to get "tweedle of bagpipes." What can there be in that sentence which necessitates, or even justifies, such a division of words?

Some 40 years ago a radical magazine in New York called *The Masses* started publishing poetry like this, and I wrote them a letter of challenge suggesting that they should take some unpublished poem by one of their so-called modern poets and print it as prose, and offer a prize to any reader of their publication who could divide that prose into lines in the same way that the poet had done. . . . *The Masses* did not accept my challenge, and I'm not sure that they even published my letter, so the problem has stayed in my mind all the time. I have been confirmed in my suspicion that the reason the poet divides his poem into lines is in order that we may know that it is poetry and not prose, but still that doesn't explain why he doesn't divide before the word "and" and before the word "the." That is what I am asking help about.

Corona, Calif. UPTON SINCLAIR

[Poets, speak up! – THE EDITORS]

Hoover on Roosevelt

● I would like to comment on the recent speech of Herbert Hoover in which he charged President Roosevelt with selling "the freedom of half a billion people down the river." This is a serious charge for an ex-President to make against his successor, especially when Mr. Roosevelt is not alive to answer the accusation, and it certainly is far from the truth.

Mr. Hoover is justly indignant about "favoritism in government loans and contracts" and "the five-percenters, mink coats, deep freezers and free hotel bills." Yet this same Mr. Hoover sat in the cabinet of President Harding and never uttered a word of protest against the scandals of that corrupt administration. The stealing of government oil lands in the Elk Hills and Teapot Dome reservations (for which his fellow cabinet member, Albert Fall, went to jail) have never been mentioned by our self-righteous ex-President. Nor has he ever condemned the

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Yes, But . . .

He [William Randolph Hearst] gave unto his writers absolute freedom of expression except when such thinking interfered with his basic policy. – *James Wright Brown in* Editor & Publisher.

Things Are Tough All Over

A new problem has arisen to thwart owners of great houses who wish to rid themselves of homes they no longer find convenient to occupy. Many who would actually realize a financial gain by giving such properties away are now discovering that organizations which could operate on a tax-free basis no longer consider it advantageous to accept such gifts. – *From Mary Dougherty's social column in the Chicago* Sun-Times.

The Privileged and the Dead

On the proposed regulation to forbid a knocked out fighter from returning to action for a long period, Mr. Eagan (Edward P. F. Eagan, chairman of the State Athletic Commission) noted he didn't want to "deprive underprivileged kids of a living." – *From an interview with Mr. Eagan in the* World-Telegram and Sun *on the recent death of George Flores.*

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR SEPT. 24, 1951

5 Corruption and the Truman Campaign An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 NAM and the Dead
6 Reaction in Iran
6 Texas Loyalty
7 Rankin Cries "Repeal"
7 AFL v. Wetback Labor
7 Price-Control Revision
8 A Communication: Kashmir—A Pakistan Viewpoint
9 Outside America
10 Revolt in the Soviet Satellites? by Tris Coffin
12 Gangs and Goons, by Albert N. Votaw
13 Europe the Battleground, by Michael Straight
16 Harold L. Ickes
17 Books:
17 Canada: The Problems of Political Sovereignty, by C. Hartley Grattan
19 "A History of Medicine," reviewed by C.-E. A. Winslow
19 "The Political Collapse of Europe," reviewed by Hans Kohn
20 Fiction Parade
20 Movies
22 Music

EDITOR: Michael Straight
EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller
ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Arnold J. Heidenheimer
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler
DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)
COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1951, IN THE U. S. A. BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

ALL IKE had to say was "No." Former GOP Chairman Hugh Scott went to Paris to sound him out. Ike could have stopped his candidacy then and there. He did not. Scott reported back enthusiastically, and immediately hard-headed politicians, led by Tom Dewey, announced Ike would run. Ex-Sen. Harry Darby will manage Ike-GHQ in Washington. Over and above Scott's information this column is positively assured Ike has made up his mind. He will not play coy. His answer is "Yes," and he will resign as Supreme Commander and take off his uniform the instant he announces his intent.

This means a showdown battle with Taft as to who runs the Republican Party. The fight has started and it could be as exciting as the subsequent Presidential race itself. Behind Taft are the Midwest isolationists, the reactionaries, the Chicago *Tribune*, the Hearst press and Joe McCarthy. The Dewey-Saltonstall-Eisenhower Republican group on the other hand represents moderate conservatism at home and, abroad, the internationalism of Vandenberg, Stimson and Elihu Root.

At San Francisco last week Republican Governor Earl Warren told reporters he would welcome a showdown Republican convention floor fight to decide once and for all who owned the party. He says flatly that McCarthy is killing the GOP and that Taft can't beat Truman. That is just what Democrats here believe.

Funniest thing is the transformation of Acheson to a popular hero since his TV performance against Gromyko. Probably it won't last. But those very qualities in Acheson that infuriate Congressmen—imperturbability and steely good manners—helped squelch the Russians. It seemed to millions of Americans watching the TV show in California that instead of being "soft" to Communism as McCarthy has monotonously charged, Acheson was knocking the daylights out of Soviet delegates and doing it with an icy politeness that made it all the more galling and devastating.

On the world front we are reaching a climax. Five years after World War II we pledged ourselves never to let our enemies rearm; we are now making their rearmament the condition for taking them back into respectability. First Japan, now Germany. Aside from the tragic irony of the situation the fact is that it is forced upon us by Moscow, and Moscow is now given another invitation to end the cold war. The Big Three foreign ministers fear that piling the German agreement on top of the Japanese Treaty may bring Armageddon. So they made a gesture of conciliation at the end of their Washington conference.

People who get a sense of security from rumors of so-called "fantastic new weapons" have two announcements to comfort them. Admiral Lynde McCormick in New York has now stated positively that we have new, smaller A-bombs that can be used more conveniently. Simultaneously the first squadron of robot light bombers is being established in Florida as a remote-controlled guided missile. We have never shared the soothing feeling commonly produced by tales of such mechanistic developments. They remind us too much of the formula a friend developed for soothing a puppy. Night after night the little dog whined and sobbed in the cellar. Assuming that it wanted maternal reassurance our friend wrapped an old alarm clock in a wool blanket and put it in the bed with the dog who snuggled up to the device and whined no more, calmed by hearing the beating of its supposed mother's heart. Those who take comfort from A-bomb progress, unaccompanied by any moral advance, remind us of the self-deluded puppy.

Columnist Joseph Alsop shows that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

professional ex-Red Louis Budenz contradicted himself under oath about the political affiliations of John Stewart Service, one of the State Department China desk officials the McCarran committee is trying to picture as a Communist plotter. When Senator Lehman (D, N.Y.) sought to put this and other Alsop columns into the Congressional *Record*, Republicans objected. The McCarran evidence so far is almost wholly hearsay, and the victims of the attack have not been permitted to testify. Meanwhile the China Lobby goes uninvestigated. But a big new development has occurred, the charges of graft and corruption against Nationalist China by high officers of its own purchasing mission here. Even Senator Knowland (R, Calif.), an uncomplicated extrovert, is a little daunted in his support of Chiang. The defense of Chiang has become so passionate and personal, however, among the pro-China Lobby, anti-Acheson crowd that it could lose us the cold war. Fifty-six Senators have signed a round robin against taking Mao's China into the UN under any circumstances. This comes as impartial experts on the Far East plead for a flexible policy and stress the possibility—remote though it may be—of weaning China away from Moscow.

Notes: John T. Flynn will replace Shirer as commentator on the new Liberty network; Flynn's *The Road Ahead* is the "Bible" of the Roosevelt-hating Committee for Constitutional Government. . . . Liberal, earnest Chester Bowles is just the man to send as US Ambassador to suspicious India; so good in fact that Senate conservatives will try to block him. . . . MacArthur-supporter David Lawrence has respectfully asked his hero not to wear an army uniform while delivering political speeches. . . . Eulogies for retiring George Marshall strengthen the opinion that McCarthy made his biggest blunder in trying to paint Marshall as pro-Red. . . . McCarthy is scheduled to testify in Drew Pearson's $5,100,000 libel suit September 25. . . . The steel shortage is appearing punctually; Truman was denounced for suggesting precautionary government stand-by plants a year ago.

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

bootleg graft in which Attorney General Daugherty was implicated during the era of the "Noble Experiment."

Ex-President Hoover adds no lustre to his administration by endeavoring to cast shame upon his successors in public office.

Portland, Ore. GEORGE H. HORNE

Decline of New England

● Mr. Walton Wickett seems to me to be totally wrong in his letter in your September 10 issue in which he attributes the relative decline of New England in the importance of our total national economy to high income taxes, and urges adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment limiting federal income taxes to not more than 25 percent.

If a man is motivated primarily by the desire to build a fortune, he could do so under the present law and pay only 25-percent income taxes by investing in a new company, and if it is highly successful when he sells his shares for a large profit years later, he will pay only a 25-percent capital-gains tax.

As a matter of fact, he can avoid even that tax and the inheritance tax by making gifts (if his wife is living) of $60,000 worth of stock to his children plus $6,000 to each of them every year thereafter up to two years before his death. If his wife is dead, he can only make gifts of half that size.

Furthermore, if a rich man goes into business for himself and loses his money, under the existing high rates of tax Uncle Sam takes the rap to the extent of his highest bracket.

The biggest fallacy in Mr. Wickett's plea for adoption of the Rich Man's Amendment to the Constitution is that New England's decline is relative. The present heavy income taxes apply to all sections of the country, and they have not prevented men in other sections from going ahead and developing those sections at a faster rate than New England has developed.

New York City ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

It Was Two Other Noblemen

● In his article about Mao Tse-tung (*NR*, September 3), M. N. Roy says that "his [Mao's] prototype in European history was von Hutten, the feudal nobleman who believed himself to be the natural leader of the peasantry and was carried away by his fascination for adventure."

This is not quite correct. Ulrich von Hutten was not a "feudal nobleman"; he came from a poor knightly family, that is, from the lower nobility, and was a starving déclassé most of his life. He did not believe himself to be "the natural leader of the peasantry." A poet and satirist, he had only a very short fling at revolutionary activity when he joined Franz von Sickingen in the revolt of the *lower nobility* against the feudal princes. Mr. Roy had apparently in mind two other German noblemen who actually were military leaders of the rebellious peasants: Goetz von Berlichingen, who was immortalized by Goethe, and Florian Geyer, the tragic hero of a play by Gerhart Hauptmann. As to Mao, his opposition to the peasants' revolt, as presented by Mr. Roy, would rather tend to prove that, if he were able or willing to analyze his subconscious mind, he would have seen himself not as "the natural leader of the peasantry," but rather as a modern counter-part of Franz von Sickingen, i.e., as the leader of the lower nobility, as it were, of would-be office-holding "outs," in revolt against modern China's feudal princes, as represented by Chiang Kai-shek's crowd of financiers, bureaucratic "ins" and grafting generals.

New York City MAX NOMAD

Where They Talk of Peace

● . . . I sincerely hope and pray that the American people are not being taken in by all this political jockeying and will assert themselves before the rabble-rousing troublemakers plunge the entire world into a slaughter house.

I recently visited Spain, Italy, France, Greece, Turkey and Israel, and nowhere did I hear of one word of war—only peace.

Paterson, N. J. ABRAHAM BERNSTEIN

The Supreme Court

● Implicit in Mr. Gressman's excellent piece, "The Tragedy of the Supreme Court" (*NR*, September 3, 1951), is a sharp warning to those who would take extreme positions in American politics. Only 15 years ago, liberals almost unanimously deplored the Nine Old Men's intrusions into the field of legislative judgment. Fashionable liberal viewpoint denied completely the power of judicial review as a bit of historical legerdemain put over by Chief Justice John Marshall.

Today the liberal cry is different—we bemoan with Mr. Gressman the Court's "reversion to judicial impotence." We implore the Court to correct what Mr. Gressman calls "popular and legislative lawlessness"; and when it fails, we call the failure tragic. The idiom has changed. The fight is the same.

Walla Walla, Wash. CHARLES F. LUCE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 125, NUMBER 13, ISSUE 1921, WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 24, 1951 **New Republic**

CORRUPTION AND THE TRUMAN CAMPAIGN

HARRY TRUMAN plainly seems to be a candidate for the Presidency in 1952. The 1952 campaign will set the course for mobilization, for inflation, for the continued expansion of our economy, for tolerance and civil rights, and for international action to secure peace. On every one of these issues Truman will stand on the right side. And yet, unless his opponent is Taft or MacArthur, Truman may not win the independent voters who determine elections and who agree with most of his views.

The Republicans have already hoisted three battle flags for 1952—MacArthurism, McCarthyism and mink coats. Of these, the first two seem today to be the preeminent threats which may serve to confuse and divide Americans. Yet there are many indications that courage and a positive program can contain MacArthur's ranting and McCarthy's lies. It may well be that the issue of corruption in government, symbolized by the mink coat, may cause more voters to cast a protest vote against Truman, or to stay away from the polls, than any other issue in 1952.

No amount of invective heaped upon the Congress, no bids to the primary interests of workers, farmers and minority groups, are going to offset a general conviction among Americans that the Democratic Party has turned rotten through holding office too long. The evidence to support that belief is mounting day by day:

The permanent Senate Investigations Subcommittee is now holding hearings to determine whether Democratic National Chairman William Boyle Jr., in exchange for a reported $8,000 in "commissions," helped the American Lithofold Corporation of St. Louis to get loans from the RFC amounting to $565,000, after the RFC had rejected the company's applications three times;

Two House committees are investigating the Securities and Exchange Commission, and in particular the large number of cases in which Commission officials have resigned to join the staffs of companies which have received favors from the SEC;

The House Judiciary Committee is inquiring into abuses of government positions by businessmen serving in defense agencies "without compensation";

Subcommittees of both the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees are investigating the Bureau of Internal Revenue on charges that its employees have covered up graft and been guilty of undue leniency in income tax collections. Eight Bureau officials have already resigned or been suspended or removed in connection with these charges, and the tax inquiry is only beginning.

In all these cases, the President is very far from the crusader for good government of the Truman committee. Senate committees investigating corruption have been subjected to White House pressure. Grand juries unearthing ugly facts in the Internal Revenue Bureau have received less than full co-operation from the regular departments of the government. Investigations of the China Lobby and the aviation lobby stop short when they approach the Presidential circle. Senator Kefauver is heartily disliked among leading Democrats. St. Louis, a Presidential stronghold, has been a wellspring of poisonous corruption from the day that Truman placed the Democratic Party in Bob Hannegan's hands.

President Truman has yet to make an example of men around him caught in unsavory acts. Belated action, taken in a campaign year, will not bring back the independents who switched to Truman in the summer of 1948. He now has only a few months in which to correct the growing impression that the Democratic Party has opened the doors to an entirely new class of profiteers who enrich themselves on federal expenditures.

There is no use pointing out that Republicans such as Senator Brewster are worse than any Democrats. The role of Administration leaders on the airline subsidy bill is bad enough. The President himself must begin to create a new atmosphere. The first step is removing William M. Boyle from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee.

There would be no loss to the Democratic Party in the firing of Bill Boyle. Under his leadership, party discipline has collapsed and party organization has withered away. Young and vital men have sought other outlets. Only the party hacks, the new class of profiteers and those wholly committed to the party as the means of achieving the Fair Deal remain. By removing from party chairmanship one whose reputation and whose accomplishments are under a cloud, President Truman can begin to give new spirit to government service and party organization in American politics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WEEK

NAM AND THE DEAD

Malcolm Forbes has long been a writer of news and events in the world of business and finance as was his father, Bertie Charles Forbes, before him. Both are recognized as among the foremost chroniclers of business history.

Recently, son Malcolm, editor of the fashionably conservative *Forbes Magazine of Business*, apparently no longer able to suppress himself, uncorked a potent editorial haymaker at the National Association of Manufacturers entitled, "The NAM Would Do Better Dead."

"Today, those who believe in free enterprise," he wrote, "would be far better off if the NAM would jump into one of the holes it is constantly digging."

Editor Forbes then proceeded to chide the NAM for its "latest bumptious bumbling," its blast against Mobilization Director Charles Wilson and Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston. "Because they agree with many of the best business brains in the country on the need for temporary controls in the present crisis," wrote the editor, "and disagree with the small hierarchy determining NAM policies, these men have lost power to think properly. They're now prisoners of the New Deal. What malarky!"

The editorial then proceeded to charge that the NAM support of legislation was tantamount to a "kiss of death." The climax, he felt, was the pictures throughout the nation's press of executives in white tie and tails, "listening to speeches about 'What This Country Needs'."

"Unfortunately," Forbes continued, "a lot of people think the NAM speaks for American business, that their policies and pronouncements reflect the opinions of most of management and the owners of business. Fortunately, in fact, they don't."

Brandishing its own sword in dauntless, reflex defense, the *NAM News* published a quick and bitter reply: "From the depths of his profound ignorance of the NAM and its methods of operations, Malcolm Forbes has dredged up all the ancient clichés which even the most ardent enemies of free enterprise have abandoned as illogical and ludicrous per se."

The members of the NAM, the answer asserted, have not been and will not be "dissuaded by the vituperation, vilification and malignment which has been concentrated on their association."

REACTION IN IRAN

Mohammed Mossadegh's devil-may-care government appears to have shot its bolt. Its refusal of Britain's compromise offers have brought only a Pyrrhic victory, for it cannot sell oil that is not coming out of the ground. It has no support from any major world power and is close to bankruptcy. Already the cautious are beginning to leave its camp to seek grace in the eyes of the British-influenced oligarchy which is ready to step back into full power when Mossadegh fails. Although Mossadegh still has the support of the general population, the various political and religious cliques which coalesced into his nationalist movement are beginning to break away. In three successive tries, Mossadegh failed to get a parliamentary quorum to support his ultimatum to the British.

The British, in a narrow way, have played their cards well. They let Mossadegh run wild, helped turn Western opinion against him and shut off all possible sources of financial aid. The World Bank, presumably at their behest, has announced that it is holding up Iran's loan request pending settlement of the oil issue. A cartel-like arrangement among British and American oil companies has effectively denied the Iranians shipping, while managing to supply most of the areas which previously received petroleum from Abadan. The only agreement the Iranians have been able to make is to sell $3 million of stored oil to be delivered by truck to the Afghan border.

This failure has reflected strongly on Mossadegh's internal political strength. Because he was so busy howling against the British, he was never able to organize the spontaneous popular movement which sprang up around his cause. He has not set forth a program to hold the allegiance of the people when their fervor for national self-fulfillment chills before the realities of a situation which they cannot affect. Mossadegh's movement was a radical, and a potentially revolutionary, one, but it has rested on shifting sands. Barring a sudden change in direction, its continued decline is inevitable. Already a pro-British former strong man, Said Zia ed-Din Tabatabai, has dared openly to form an opposition group opposed to Mossadegh's oil policy.

The reaction has appeared, and what revolution there was is petering out. Its demise is a sad one, at least to those who believe that in the long run almost any change in Iran's feudal order is for the best. But a revolution, even in the Middle East, must be built around more than an old man and oil in the ground.

TEXAS LOYALTY

AUSTIN, TEX. (NR corresp.)

An attempt by the Texas Legislature to require a 10-year backward-looking loyalty oath from state employees and state college faculty members has been ruled out in part by Attorney General Price Daniel.

The oath required all state employees, as a prerequisite to receiving their pay checks, to swear that they had not during the previous 10 years belonged to any organization on the US Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. It was enacted as a rider on the appropriation bill, placed there by a 10-member conference committee, and the individual legislators had no chance to vote on the proposal.

Daniel held that such an oath was legal as a condition of the appropriation bill only for the present and future.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, he held legal a revised oath that only employees at present members of such organizations could be fired. This is just as legal, he said, as a provision that persons who drink intoxicants on the job cannot continue as state employees.

But the 10-year backward look, Daniel held, is illegal as a part of an appropriation bill, because activities of employees in the past has nothing to do with their present ability to work for the state.

Daniel advised the University of Texas Board of Regents, which had asked for the ruling, that a general law requiring a 10-year-back oath might be drawn so as to be constitutional. He did not rule, because he wasn't asked to, on a general law passed in 1949, requiring all college students and faculty members to take an oath that they do not, and have not for two years past, belonged to any organization advocating overthrow of the government by force.

The University of Texas immediately began distributing the US Attorney General's long list and the oath as revised by Daniel to its employees and faculty members. No one refused to sign it.

RANKIN CRIES "REPEAL"

Some 120 years ago, a District of Columbia Legislative Assembly, set up by Congress to govern the nation's capital, passed two laws barring discrimination against restaurant patrons because of "race, color or previous condition of servitude" (1872) and forbidding discrimination against any "well-behaved or respectable person" (1873). Two years later, the Assembly was abolished, and the laws have not been enforced since that date.

When the "lost" laws were uncovered last year, two Negroes brought a test suit against Thompson's Restaurant which had refused to serve them. The Municipal Court of Appeals early this spring upheld the 1873 law, and the case is now pending before the US Court of Appeals. Last week Rep. John Rankin (D, Miss.) introduced a bill to repeal both laws. To "break the custom now," Rankin said, "will only mean race trouble here." Rankin might be reminded that whenever federal civil-rights legislation is up for consideration, he indignantly claims that the government has no right to interfere in state matters. By the same token, the District of Columbia and the federal courts should be capable of settling capital problems without help from a Mississippi busybody.

AFL v. WETBACK LABOR

When President Truman reluctantly signed the farm-labor import bill last July, he admitted that the new law "hardly touches" the basic problem—the steady stream of illegal "wetbacks" from Mexico who are crossing the Rio Grande at an increasing rate. The President called on Congress to pass immediate supplemental legislation that would provide criminal penalties for US citizens who smuggle, harbor or transport wetbacks and would give the Immigration Service more authority and additional funds to expand its border guard.

Because Congress has not acted on any of the President's recommendations, AFL President William Green early this month called a meeting of delegates from Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California to draft a program on Mexican labor imports. AFL members met with officials of the Mexican Confederation of Labor and its union affiliates to consider ways to forestall the exploitation of Mexican workers. "The problem is an immediate one," said H. L. Mitchell, president of the AFL National Farm Labor Union. "Mexican laborers are now being loaded like work animals onto trucks and are being sent to the Pecos Valley to pick cotton at 50 cents an hour, or two dollars a hundred pounds. This was the rate paid by callous Pecos growers in 1942, when cotton was selling at 20 cents a pound. The present market price is 35 cents. That means that while wages are held at starvation levels, the profits of these exploiters have increased to record-breaking levels."

The US and Mexican national labor organizations are exploring the possibility that Mexican workers, admitted under the US-Mexican agreement, would cross the border under the protection of the AFL and Mexican Federation of Labor. They would then take up union membership, refusing to work for wages below those paid AFL unions.

PRICE-CONTROL REVISION

In line with President Truman's request for revision of the Defense Production Act, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is holding hearings on three restrictive provisions: the Capehart amendment, which places a sky-high floor under future ceiling prices of manufactured products; the amendment which prohibits the use of livestock slaughter quotas; and the Act's new import restrictions on several agricultural products which violate our reciprocal trade agreements and afford unnecessary protection of our domestic producers.

Labor and consumer groups opposed these and other amendments when the Defense Production Act was jammed through Congress at the end of July. CIO President Philip Murray, in a letter to the Senate committee, objected to the committee's rule that "limits discussion to three weaknesses of the law, when in actual fact it has many other serious shortcomings."

The Herlong amendment, for example, means that future wholesale and retail ceiling prices will include the cost of a product *plus* the businessman's pre-Korean percentage markup. It picks up the manufacturer's price (in most cases subject to increases under the Capehart amendment) and provides the legal procedure for additional increases in wholesale and retail ceiling prices. Murray pointed out that the Act should include provision for the use of subsidies to control retail food prices, the establishment of dollar-and-cent price ceilings, grade labeling, protection for the continued production and sale of low-priced goods, and control of commodity exchange transactions.

"The Act needs strengthening," Murray said. "Its loopholes should be plugged in order to curb inflationary pressures that will be building up this winter and spring." With its adjournment goal of early October, Congress has no intention of going beyond the three amendments now being considered.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION: Kashmir—A Pakistan Viewpoint

SIR: In your issue dated August 20 appears a dispatch by Krishnalal Shridharani on the existing tension between India and Pakistan. Unfortunately, it is the official Delhi version, with the result that Pakistan emerges from Mr. Shridharani's account as the villain of the piece.

To understand the causes of the existing tension between India and Pakistan, attention has to be focused on one basic fact: that India has not accepted the fact of partition, in other words, the existence of Pakistan, and has striven all along and continues an attempt to undo it. Threats by India to devastate the rich agricultural lands in West Pakistan by shutting off irrigation water, an 18-month-long trade war with the aim of breaking Pakistan's economy, India's grab of Kashmir, and all other disputes stem from this single purpose. We Pakistanis have known this all along, but our foreign friends found it hard to believe. It is now apparent from Mr. Shridharani's dispatch as well as from utterances of India's official representatives.

What has made this confession of perfidy necessary? The answer lies in the untenable position in which India finds herself *vis-à-vis* the Kashmir dispute. India is committed to a solution of the problem through a free and impartial plebiscite. Since January, 1949, up to date, about a dozen different proposals, including arbitration by an arbitrator of unimpeachable impartiality, have been sponsored at various times either by the UN Security Council or the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference for securing conditions for a free and impartial plebiscite. Every one of these proposals has been accepted by Pakistan and rejected by India. India is in an advantageous position as she holds the greater and the best part of Kashmir, and she feels that left to herself she is strong enough to absorb that territory. Unfortunately, for India, the question continues to receive attention everywhere as it constitutes a serious threat to world peace. This has made India desperate.

In recent days, therefore, Indian spokesmen have changed their technique. In their exposition of the Kashmir problem, the question of a free and impartial plebiscite for the unhappy people of that territory is completely by-passed and India's title in Kashmir is argued ab initio. Accordingly, Mr. Shridharani finds no difficulty in establishing India's complete title to Kashmir, without any necessity of a plebiscite.

Mr. Shridharani argues that India has a legal as well as a moral title to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. According to him, accession by the ruler of that state gave India a legal title because "each ruling prince was free to decide whether to join his state to India or to Pakistan." One would like to ask Mr. Shridharani whether this freedom of choice was confined only to the ruler of Jammu and Kashmir or whether it was available to all princes, of whom there were over 500 at the time of partition. What happened to the ruler of Hyderabad who decided for independence, and to the ruler of Junagadh who acceded to Pakistan? In both cases rulers were Moslems and the majority of the people Hindus. The territories of both were overrun and occupied by brute force. That shows the worth of legal title conferred by Mr. Shridharani on India.

The reasoning in support of India's moral title to the state of Jammu and Kashmir is more tortuous. It is as follows: India did not really agree to the "inhuman principle of partition." For the sake of the safety of 40 million Moslems in India, India must defeat the two-nation theory, and to defeat the two-nation theory must have Kashmir.

Stated in blunt terms, the argument amounts to this: the honor, lives and liberty of 40 million Moslems in India will be forfeit unless India is allowed to keep Kashmir. It brings before the mind the picture of a mad killer who holds an innocent child in the line of fire so that he can escape from armed pursuers. It will be a black day indeed in the annals of civilization if such an argument is allowed to prevail.

The 40 million Moslems in India cannot have a fair deal in the caste-ridden society of India. The only foundation for their security would be a sense of honor and respect for commitments among Indian leaders and government. But these have been shown to be non-existent by the facility with which the partition agreement has been repudiated.

Moreover, if today India must have Kashmir to defeat the two-nation theory, tomorrow it will be Pakistan herself. This reasoning is thus a challenge to Pakistan's right to existence. It is, therefore, for Pakistan a matter of self-preservation to defeat this argument.

Mr. Shridharani has also followed the standard Indian practice of prattling about Sheikh Abdullah's leadership as proof of alleged local Moslem support for Indian occupation. If there were any truth in this, India should have welcomed a fair and impartial plebiscite which alone could effectively demonstrate to the world the real will of the Kashmiri people on the question of accession to India or Pakistan.

This background makes clear the causes of tension between India and Pakistan. The danger of war was multiplied immeasurably when India massed her armed forces on Pakistan's borders. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has repeatedly proposed settlement of all outstanding disputes through negotiation, mediation and, if necessary, arbitration. But Mr. Nehru, while professing peaceful intentions, recoils from all suggestions of arbitration.

It is for the free world to suggest what course of action Pakistan is to adopt. Arbitration? India says: No. Abject submission to brute force? If not, then what?

U. AHMAD ANSARI
Press Attaché, Embassy of Pakistan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Outside America

EUROPE ON SAN FRANCISCO

On the day of the arrival of Japanese Premier Shigeru Yoshida in San Francisco, the leading story in the European edition of the New York *Times* said: "Mr. Acheson told the Premier that the United States regarded the peace treaty as preliminary to the conclusion of a United States-Japanese bilateral-security arrangement." If the word "preliminary" were replaced by "subordinate," the sentence would fairly well state the general Western European attitude toward the relations between the treaty and the arrangement.

The restraint and careful tact with which most newspapers (except the Communist of course) treated the proceedings at San Francisco formed a not quite opaque veneer over many and varied doubts. Of the length of the proceedings, the London *Times* said they were too long for a ceremony and too short for a conference.

A point on which many newspapers dwelt was the controversy between Secretary Acheson and Prime Minister Nehru on whether the Japanese people really welcomed the American version of generosity to a conquered foe; and a number which ordinarily reject the Indians' equivocations about the problem of security of the free world tended nevertheless to support his view of the Japanese attitude.

The London *Observer* wrote:

> More than 50 percent of the [Japanese] people (according to a poll of public opinion taken by the newspaper *Yomiuri*) are strongly against the garrisoning by American troops. . . . [This] is resented by all, not only on sentimental grounds as an infringement of Japanese sovereignty, but from a genuine fear that it may incite attack by Russia. . . . The one feeling which seems to be common to Japanese of all classes is a passionate desire to remain neutral and never more be drawn into war. They do not appear to object to rearmament; but they are very much afraid of a revival of the old militarism. And the transfer of power by General MacArthur to the Japanese Government has indeed been followed by many signs of a return to the old totalitarian rule. The trade unions now find themselves coldly regarded in high quarters. . . . The increasing power of the police has caused many misgivings.

The London Sunday *Times* wrote:

> Japan will set up a new economic order. . . . The first moves will be: revision of the occupation labor-standard laws so that wages may be cut sharply, working hours lengthened, and such "democratic excesses" as overtime pay and annual leave "brought into line with Japanese practice"; re-examination of the occupation antitrust and deconcentration laws . . . to enable the depurged Zaibatsu to regroup discreetly for more effective development of Southeast Asian markets; virtual resurrection of the wartime "Asiatic Co-Prosperity Sphere" as a means of circumventing reparation demands.

The news agency of the Vatican's Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith commented on the American mandate over the Ryukyus that:

> For America . . . to take land away from Japan would be unworthy of the reputation she has won among the Japanese. . . . To take even the meager economic resources of these islands and to place them under American control would be like allowing a rich man to encroach on the miserable belongings of a poor laborer and would be a blot on the fair name of America. . . .

Robert Guillain, one of Europe's best-known writers on Japanese affairs, whose articles appear both in the *Monde* of Paris and in the Manchester *Guardian*, writes that various plans for an outright economic alliance, prepared by the Japanese of the far Right, whereby Japan would become "one of the principal arsenals of the United States and of the Atlantic Community," are being studied in Washington. One of the plans was drawn up by Hatoyama, right-wing leader in Premier Yoshida's party, and a number of not yet purged old-guardists including ex-Admiral Nomura, who was Ambassador in Washington at the time of Pearl Harbor, and Takahashi, ex-director of heavy industry in the Japanese puppet state, Manchukuo.

The United States-Japanese bilateral-security arrangement, he says, will give the Japanese old-guardists the right to continue their prewar "co-prosperity sphere" activity on the mainland of Asia at the price of acceptance of a regime within Japan very much like the even older "capitulations" system on the Chinese coast. He writes:

> The security agreement will, for example, put the Japanese communications system entirely at the disposal of the Americans; it will give the right to use the public services, the right to carry out maneuvers in certain regions outside the military bases, the right to carry out geodesic work everywhere, etc. The United States appears to have been careful above all to retain the greatest possible freedom of action in the event of international crises. Although the American forces will be subject in principle to Japanese law, they will get considerable privileges in regard to judicial matters, fiscal and customs exceptions, etc., which will put them under a regime not far removed from the one which used to be called the capitulations.

In common with most other commentators Guillain stresses that the "new deal" in Asia is very different from the security pattern in Europe—to the benefit, of course, of European notions of independence. But the idea that "it can happen here" which has brought restraint and tact into Western European criticisms of the proceedings at San Francisco has been impaired by persistent rumors that the Japanese-American bilateral pact is to be the preface to a German-American treaty next autumn.

While the San Francisco conference was going on, a documentary film on Japan made by the J. Arthur Rank organization in England was being shown in a large film theatre in Paris. The sound track in French was tactful but nevertheless quite clear in voicing doubts about the American plan for Japan and Asia. It was not interest in, affection for, or even hatred for the Japanese that made the listening public applaud the implied and oblique criticism of the masterwork of John Foster Dulles. It was the disturbing feeling that something not entirely unlike that which has happened—and may happen—in Asia may in fact happen here in Europe.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVOLT IN THE SOVIET SATELLITES?

by Tris Coffin

RESISTANCE against Communist dictatorship is mounting in Russia, China and the satellite nations as oppression increases and living standards fall. How far is this resistance organized? How far can it be organized? Where does it lead? How much help can it be given? The scale of US action is rising rapidly. The demand in Congress for bolder action is rising more rapidly and ranges from Brien McMahon, who believes in peace but can see little hope for peace while Communist regimes survive, to Pat McCarran, who talks of inevitable war.

The aid which refugee and underground leaders propose be given by the United States falls into three categories—moral, organizational and material.

First, the President of the US, the Secretary of State or Congress is asked to make a clear statement that this nation regards as its friends those who would throw off the tyranny of Communist dictatorship. The proponents argue that, after all, this is a pale statement compared to the calls for revolution issued by the Cominform and Communist parties. But Secretary of State Acheson regards this as a violation of international law and in effect a declaration of war.

Second, the US is urged to organize effectively the talents, intelligence and energy of the several million escapees from the East. Volunteers of military age would be enlisted in the American Army and placed in separate and unofficial "liberation army" units. Leaders with imagination and initiative would be brought together, fed and housed while they worked on plans for undermining Communist regimes. The knowledge of the refugees would be organized in an international intelligence service.

Third, free nations of the West are asked to set up communications with organized undergrounds and to furnish them with weapons. Again, free nations are being urged to do what Russia has done since 1945.

Those insisting on immediate aid contend that resistance against Communism seems to be rising toward a peak. In Bulgaria, they say the once powerful Agrarian Party has developed a large-scale underground network which is said to reach into the puppet government. Another underground has been organized by the Free Bulgarian Society. Partisan bands led by former army officers strike at Communist warehouses and transports. It has become unhealthy to belong to the Communist Party and desertions are common. In one typical village, Slobodin, 85 percent of the CP members have deserted, according to Yugoslav informants. The Communist administration makes no bones about its troubles and recent official statements cry out against "class enemies . . . organized criminal bands composed of kulaks and corrupted elements . . . enemies who deliberately sneak contaminated grain into granaries." Moscow has admitted some six attempts to overthrow the Communist regime in Bulgaria and blamed them on the "American and British Imperialists." Since early this year, 146,000 have fled from Bulgaria to Turkey. The Bulgarian authorities have cleared an area 15 meters in depth along the Greek border, put up barbed wire and stationed troops there to prevent escapes.

In Rumania, guerrilla units in the mountains of North Moldova have been attacking Soviet military trains. When Rumanian puppet troops failed to wipe out the partisans, Russian units went into action. According to recent reports the rebels are still harassing military trains and boldly attacking Rumanian militia encampments.

In Hungary, official statements last month revealed stay-away strikes by coal miners, withholding of crops by peasants on a wholesale basis, sabotage and murder of Communist officials. A statement on grain deliveries says, "It has now been disclosed that the comparatively low collection average must be mainly attributed to the deliberate sabotage of the enemy infiltrating into the people's councils."

In Poland, resistance developed to the point at which Molotov had to be sent in to threaten mass reprisals. Farmers are withholding produce; city populations are going hungry. There is said to be a well-organized and extensive underground.

In Czechoslovakia, grain deliveries are far behind quotas, again due to deliberate withholding. On August 14 in Slovakia, for example, the wheat deliveries were 64 percent under the quota; rye, 70 percent under; barley, 64 percent under and oats, 92 percent under, according to official statements. In factories, slowdowns are reported to be widespread.

In Albania, according to escapees in Yugoslavia, the army is ready to turn on the Hoxha regime. A story is told of soldiers in the 825th Albanian Battalion tearing down Stalin's picture.

In the Russian zones of both Germany and Austria, resistance is open. In the East-zone city of Saalfeld recently, some 1,000 miners broke into the Communist

Tris Coffin is a radio commentator, former columnist of Washington Daybook, magazine writer and author of Missouri Compromise.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

police headquarters, broke furniture, locked the police chief in a cell and fought the reinforcements. This was in protest of the arrest of four miners. When the Communists threatened reprisals, the miners threatened to flood the mines. In Austria, the Communists are blaming "American counter-intelligence" for "terrorist acts" including, they claim, bombings, arson and prison escapes of political prisoners.

There is real fear among the advocates of revolt that if the West delays as much as a year, the Soviet and Cominform secret police will destroy these developing resistance movements by such mass purges as are going on now in four of the Russian republics. There is ample proof that Russia has moved already to wipe out the threat of revolt. In Bulgaria, late in July and into August, the secret police rounded up 200 important Bulgarian Communists on orders from Moscow. Those arrested included Maj. Gen. Slavcho Trnsky, chief of Bulgarian partisans during the war. In Rumania, the purge victims include the Minister of Education and a majority of the Military Magistrates, including Gen. Alexander Petrescu, chief of the Communist prison system. In Hungary, thousands of young men considered to be politically "dangerous" were shipped to Soviet labor camps in July. In Poland, Russia has undertaken a mass purge of the army, placed on trial high-ranking officers, and put Russians in key positions in the armed services.

Those who favor greater action now to aid resistance movements believe that if Russia by these methods succeeds in destroying what voices of nationalism remain in China and the satellites, it will take at least five years to build even a small network of new contacts.

There is the further danger that the undergrounds and their sympathizers will lose heart without some aid from the West. Men cannot long maintain revolt without moral and practical help. One sign is the apathy spreading today among the escapees, thanks to American indifference. Hundreds of thousands of Russians who risked their lives to desert to the West have either scattered to the four winds or are living a dull, hopeless existence in displaced-persons camps in Western Germany. A one-time colonel of the Soviet General Staff is picking oranges in California. The governor of a Federated Soviet Republic is in a DP barracks somewhere in Germany. A famous Russian submarine engineer is lost in an American city. In thousands of such cases, American counter-intelligence asked perfunctory questions of the escapees and forgot them.

The third major argument, and one carrying great weight in both Washington and London, is that some visible sign of action against Communism is needed at home. For too many people, the alternatives seem to be hope of overthrowing Stalinism short of war or McCarthyism, isolationism and acceptance of a preventive war.

A final reason given for revolt now is that Russia is militarily weaker than she is likely to be at any time in the future and therefore less likely to attack. Her World War II equipment is becoming obsolescent and her rearmament program is not yet producing large quantities of new weapons.

These are the arguments now being advanced in support of a new approach.

The arguments against throwing our shoulder hard to the cart of revolt are also pressed in government departments.

First and most important, the American military leaders have little faith in the weapon of revolt. It is regarded as a handy weapon in time of war, but an uncontrollable risk in peacetime. The Joint Chiefs of Staff put their faith in one force—superior fire power.

Second, there is fear that help by the West to the undergrounds means war. Russia has implied this. The Pentagon points out that any uprising would be answered with force. Russian troops and tanks would move in and leave us with the terrible decision to desert our friends or to start a third world war.

Third, it is argued that the United States should not encourage revolt until we are ready to back it up with our own armies. This view is preached by Assistant Secretaries of State to closed-door conferences on Capitol Hill and precludes even a statement of sympathy for those who would throw off Communism.

Fourth, the opponents of aid to the undergrounds maintain that if the West waits patiently, Eastern Europe and China will be freed by a revived nationalism which will rely on its own efforts to overthrow the Soviet empire. This hope overlooks the fact that Russia is taking physical control of the satellite armed forces in Eastern Europe, and is in effect incorporating these nations as subservient colonized republics of the Soviet empire.

Those who oppose aid argue further that the resistance to Communism is too divided to be effective. The émigré Russians for example have been told, "You will have to unite before we will even talk to you."

Lastly, it is argued that the United States has never interfered in the internal affairs of other nations and that to do so now would be to overthrow all the traditional safeguards of diplomacy to which the Russians barely subscribe but to which they might be compelled by Western strength to conform.

These are the arguments being advanced now in an unfinished debate. Its outcome depends partly, of course, on how far Russia incites and equips revolt in non-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist nations. Today, an "underground" radio station operating in fact from Russian soil calls for the overthrow of the Iranian Government, boasts the Iranian Army can be defeated in two days, and pledges that the Kurdish tribesmen will fight the Red Army "if the Red Army marches into Kurdistan once more." Strikes, sabotage and uprising against Tito are incited each day by powerful radio stations in Rumania. And, a very real threat to Japan is the massing of Soviet-trained and directed former Japanese prisoners of war on the southern tip of Sakhalin Island, a few miles from Hokkaido.

GANGS AND GOONS

by Albert N. Votaw

A WAVE of terroristic, gangster attacks upon Teamster Union officials in Chicago came into the spotlight of the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee for a brief moment. Behind this violence may lie a threat dangerous enough to warrant full investigation.

Attention was drawn to the plight of union officials last winter, when William Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, publicly appealed to the mayor for police protection against gangster intimidation. Lee's appeal occurred fairly early in a series of unsolved crimes that has included two murders, three brutal assaults and four bombings. Although Teamster officials publicly deny that anything is amiss, they are nonetheless frightened. Most of them obtained their jobs over the dead bodies of the Capone hoodlums who controlled most of the Teamster locals in Chicago from 1928 to 1935, and they certainly have no desire to reopen hostilities with the gangsters.

The most frequent victims have been officials of Truck Drivers Local 705, largest Teamster unit in the city, with a treasury approaching $700,000. Here is a brief calendar of the events:

June 1, 1950: a Local 705 business agent shot;

June 13: a Local 705 business agent killed in a never-explained hit-and-run "accident";

January 18, 1951: Lee asks for police protection, revealing he had been threatened the previous September 18;

January 19: a Local 705 business agent shot;

January 30: home of a Local 705 business agent bombed;

April 19: home of the president of another Teamster local bombed;

May 2: the man who secured the conviction of three racketeers who had tried to muscle into the Milk Drivers local beaten;

May 15: home of the Milk Drivers' secretary-treasurer bombed;

May 16: apartment of a business agent of another Teamster local bombed;

June 12: a candidate for business agent in Local 705 murdered.

Violence is not alien to the Teamsters Union. But Chicago's 100,000 teamsters have perhaps the richest heritage of this kind, dating back to a 105-day strike in 1908 which resulted in 21 deaths and the secession of 23 Chicago locals from the International Union. Civil war subsequently raged between the International and the rebels, a situation aggravated in 1928 when "Red" Barker forced his way into the offices of the Coal Handlers local, placed two loaded pistols on the president's desk and informed all who had tarried to listen that he was taking over.

In the following years, most of the independents were taken over by the Capone gang. Anti-Capone officials found their own unions slipping into the hands of the rival gangsters they had hired as bodyguards. After the machine-gunning of Barker in 1932, Capt. Daniel "Tubbo" Gilbert, newly appointed chief investigator for the State's Attorney's office in Chicago, moved in. Through a judicious mixture of false arrests, third-degree methods and "spontaneous" invasions of the Capone unions' offices, Gilbert drove the Capone gang out of the independents and forced the local back into the unwilling arms of International Teamster President Dan Tobin.

Gilbert won the undying gratitude of the new Teamster officials. Now that they feel the need for the help of an old-fashioned cop, who knows every two-bit "hood" by sight and is not averse to overlooking their constitutional rights if it means helping a friend, they mourn his parting. For Gilbert, who was disastrously defeated when he ran for sheriff of Cook County last fall, has retired from the force and from politics. Ironically, the most important single influence in wrecking the campaign of "the man who drove the gangsters from the unions" (as Gilbert likes to be called) was the Kefauver committee, which in the course of its investigations uncovered some none too helpful information about the income and associates of "the richest cop in the world" (as Gilbert came to be known).

Albert N. Votaw, reporter for a Chicago news bureau, has contributed to the New Leader, Progressive, Horizon and Politics magazines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An illuminating parallel can be drawn between the present and the post-prohibition period, which marked the peak of the gangster invasion of the unions. With the end of the Noble Experiment, the various hoodlum syndicates were left with excess money, energy and personnel. One area of "investment" to which they turned was the trade-union movement, which presented them with an unrivaled access to rich treasuries, patronage for their supernumeraries and the always tempting possibilities of strike insurance.

Today, another enforced migration of capital appears possible with federal legislation against the racing-wire services, still a major source of gangland income. Although as yet there seems to be no top-level hoodlum invasion of the unions, many of the potential future victims of this restrictive legislation—the touts, torpedoes, bookies and hangers-on—are hedging in the time-honored pattern set by their elders against the danger of having to go to work for a living.

The Teamsters, because of their facile resort to violence and their habit of selling co-operation, are particularly vulnerable to hoodlum infiltration. Indeed, they seem to regard the menace of gangsterism as a personal fight between the hoodlums and themselves. Neither do they hold much stock in any sentimental definition of unionism in terms of public good. As a friend of mine remarked, apropos of these attacks, "It couldn't have happened to a better bunch of guys."

If these events do indicate a gangland counter-offensive, more than syndical narrow-mindedness and a footnote in the Kefauver committee report will be necessary to turn it back.

EUROPE THE BATTLEGROUND

III. Union, the Means and the End

by Michael Straight

ONLY an expansionist economy can combine defense and stability in Europe. Only European Union can provide the framework for expansion.

Our Congress recognized this four years ago when it declared that the "economic integration and political unification" of Europe was a major objective of US policy.

Since then a central currency pool has been created in the European Payments Union; a central planning staff, in the Organization for European Economic Co-operation; a central military command, at Supreme Headquarters of Allied Powers in Europe. A bank without credit has been opened in the European Assembly at Strasbourg. All these are advances within the outworn framework of separate nations voluntarily co-operating with each other. Holding Europe with voluntary committees is like building a dyke with a child's sand toys.

"In 1948," the saying goes in SHAPE, "the Russians could have marched to the Atlantic in 18 days. Today things are much better. If they march they will find their way barred by innumerable committees echeloned in depth."

The committee system, as I argued a year ago, produces the maximum number of directives with the minimum effect. It offers no scope for leadership, so it attracts nonentities. On our innumerable committees, with the exception of General Eisenhower, there is no one and there can be no one who bangs heads together and insists on results. The Defense Production Board of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization meets in London and grinds out reams of recommendations which fill the pigeon holes of Europe. The Finance and Economic Board meets in Paris and offers tentative reports. The Military Standing Group meets in Washington and serves chiefly to snarl up SHAPE, three thousand miles away at Marly. The Council of Deputies, with one exception, is made up of second, third and fourth rate men, picked by the separate foreign offices on the understanding that the council, like all committees, has no original authority and should have none. Since the decisions of all these bodies, although only advisory, must be unanimous, they cannot drive ahead but must search cautiously for the area of greatest agreement, that is, for the lowest common denominator of necessary action.

The governments of Europe are pressed by the US to double their defense efforts. But they cannot finance rearmament as our government can. No government on the Continent of Europe can finance rearmament by increased taxation alone. And since national finance markets have evaporated, no government can finance rearmament by selling its own bonds to its own people. Rearmament on a national basis means for Europe the printing press and inflation.

Idle capacity still exists in Europe, and arms production is low. Italy would be delighted to produce military trucks and tanks for Belgian divisions; Belgium would be happy to make artillery for Italian divisions. But these divisions are not part of one army, and each country wants hard currency, or consumers' goods in payment for its weapons, which the other cannot provide.

Each country in Europe is still attempting to produce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its own tanks, its own jet fighters, its own anti-aircraft guns. The result is poor weapons, produced at prohibitive costs. As costs rise and inflation mounts, each government, instead of moving closer to union, retreats within its own borders and seems crushed by the weight of its internal problems. The British Government is hypnotized by the shift in the terms of trade against Britain which results partly from American rearmament and which is as costly to Britain as the additions to her own defense program. France has suffered a 24-percent increase in the cost of living in the last 12 months and faces a budget crisis as her arms program shifts from budget bureaus to machine shops and payrolls. Italy is torn among inflation, unemployment and shortage of foreign exchange. Germany is importing $10 million worth of coal each month from the US while her own production lags and Europe is starved for coal.

These problems, General Eisenhower told a group of visiting US Senators, are insoluble as long as each nation tries to meet them by acting alone. He added:

> Many of these problems would disappear if this whole area of Western Europe were one federal union. I believe this so strongly that I do not believe real security is going to be felt in the United States, in the British Empire and other nations of the globe until that comes about.

If European Union is vital, which nations are to be joined? There are no clear dividing lines, and none of the existing organizations gives any clue for future federation. There are 10 nations in SHAPE; 12 in the NATO; 14 in the Council of Europe; 16 in the EPU; 18 in the OEEC. The authority given to each body varies and is generally set by the nation most reluctant to surrender sovereignty. In the Atlantic organizations the limits are set by the US, in the European organizations by Great Britain.

Britain has refused to join a European federation, or to support one formed without her. She joined the Council of Europe principally to prevent its development along federal lines. On all committees she presses her concept of sovereign governments carrying out agreements that are voluntarily and unanimously reached.

This approach, intolerably narrow for Europe, was accepted in the hope that Britain might advance to more ambitious plans. When it became clear that Britain's attitude was rigid and reflected her needs, a break within Europe developed. A new concept is now emerging, of an inner and outer core of Europe, the outer core made up of Britain, the Scandinavian countries which support her, and the fringe nations; the inner core made up of France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux nations.

In the decisive fields of heavy industry and armed forces, this inner-core group is now merging its separate sovereignties through the Schuman Plan and the European Army.

The Schuman Plan, like the European Army, represents a wholly new pattern in Europe. Its founding treaty, in creating the "European coal and steel community," states that this action is one step in the organization of a wider union. Its purpose is "to contribute to economic expansion, the development of employment and the improvement of the standard of living in the participating countries through the institution . . . of a common market."

The treaty creates a common market for coal and steel products in place of six protected markets. It eliminates restrictions on trade and transfers powers of domestic regulation to a new international institution. The High Authority, its executive body, is able to veto investments which can be maintained only through discriminatory subsidies. It is able to finance new investments. It allocates short supplies. It supervises fair wage and employment practices, prohibiting competitive wage cutting, and raising substandard wages. The High Authority in turn is responsible to a Council of Ministers, and to a Common Assembly, appointed by the parliaments of the six nations. A Court of Justice reviews its work; a consultative committee brings in labor, management and consumer groups.

None of the six nations has enacted antitrust laws. The Schuman Plan is Europe's first antitrust law, enacted because it is organized on a European basis. Its antitrust provisions, which no member nation would impose on its own cartels alone, outlaw "all agreements among enterprises, all decisions of associations of enterprises and all concerted practices which would tend, directly or indirectly, to prevent, restrict or impede the normal operation of competition within the common market."

The European Army, under which the Schuman Plan nations with the exception of the Netherlands give up their national armed forces to create a European force, is a still greater step, a decisive step, toward union, according to Hervé Alphand, the French delegate to the NATO. Under the present plan, European units will become one force in command, in reserves, in training, in equipment, in supplies and in air support. The air forces and the general staffs of the European units will be integrated. Common European schools will replace national military academies. In place of national defense ministries there will be a European Authority, serving as a Ministry of Defense and responsible to a Council of Ministers, a European Parliamentary Assembly and a Court of Justice. A common fund will collect financial contributions and finance all expenses.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A common system of supply and a common program for armaments production, providing standardization and specialization, will follow.

By the end of this year, the European Army and the Schuman Plan should be in force. Both will compel further economic and political moves toward full federation. National budgets and defense programs will have to be brought under the central direction and review of a European defense minister. A European bank may be needed to finance an over-all program. Further agencies should follow to regulate transportation and trade. And beyond these the courts, councils and assemblies of each plan will have to be supported by fully representative institutions which can command and direct loyalty of Europeans, and express their general will.

However logical federation may be, it can succeed only if it rises from deep-seated impulse among the peoples of Europe's inner core. That impulse is rarely found on the surface of Europe. Every official of a veterans' organization, every candidate for public office, every bearded savant can still win applause by recalling ancient rivalries and outworn symbols that have drained Europe's lifeblood and brought it close to death. Is it foolhardy to assert that this response is a reflex without great significance, a façade that will go down at the first thrust of a new idea? Culturally, for the peoples of the inner core, nationalism is a powerful, even a resurgent force but one which is local, regional and racial and does not wholly correspond to the states. Politically, nationalism offers no protection and little satisfaction. To take pride politically in being French, or German or Italian is to boast of having followed Hitler, Mussolini or Petain down the road to ruin. To cling nonetheless to political nationality is to ensure a shrinking status to perpetuate the privilege of being disregarded and overridden as minor considerations in the distant capitals of Moscow and Washington where major decisions are made.

The impulse to union is a hidden subterranean impulse. That is for the very sound reason that it arises from a sense of failure and defeat which few men will openly acknowledge. The nations of the inner core are nations which have suffered in common the overwhelming and humiliating experience of defeat and occupation. Naturally they will minimize and conceal the impact of this experience. But the truth is that the Schuman Plan is succeeding in spite of its economic provisions, just as the European Army is succeeding in spite of its military requirements because both projects are recognized as steps toward the reconciliation of Germany and France, whose continued rivalry no farmer or worker, father or son, in Europe, can any longer afford.

The presence of this silent conviction is no guarantee that union will be achieved in time. The Schuman Plan has not yet been ratified. The European Army plan has not yet been finished. Uncontrolled inflation, or one false move, such as an election victory for de Gaulle, might destroy France's capacity to provide leadership. In Germany, pitfalls line the road to federation.

As an occupied power, the Germans have tried to set outrageous terms at each necessary step. When Eisenhower called the federal government's bluff on the issue of rearmament it retreated and co-operated in the European Army plan. Yet the efforts of Adenauer to promote the concept of union have been blocked by the chauvinism of Schumacher's socialists who have paid lip service to the idea of union, and fought tooth and nail against each measure of advance. Germany has recovered more rapidly than any European nation, thanks partly to $4 billion in US aid. Yet every proposal, to mobilize scrap reserves, to increase coal output, to ration raw materials, to provide land for troop maneuvers, put forward in the face of a common danger, has been opposed by Germany.

National Socialism still flows as an undercurrent in Germany. And if a static approach is taken, then at any moment impressive facts can be arrayed, strong arguments advanced, and hot emotions aroused to block the transfer of added responsibilities to such an unreliable people. Yet, in the light of any long-range approach to Western survival and development, this static approach collapses. As long as Germany is defended, subsidized, supervised and quarantined by other Western nations, the German people are bound to be ruled by neurotic emotions of self-pity, apathy, hatred and desire for revenge. Assimilation is the only cure for German nationalism. A major objective of this generation is to help Germany reach a conscious and lasting commitment to Western values that are democratic and pacific despite all passing trends. This can happen only if Germans become Europeans, and, as members of a European Union, share its responsibilities as well as its benefits. These responsibilities include the bearing of arms.

The rebirth of the German soldier is, under any circumstances, a gamble. In German uniform, a German soldier seemed an intolerable gamble to Europeans. To them the thought of a German soldier in European uniform, though repulsive, is less repulsive than the thought of a French or a Belgian youth being drafted to defend Germany. This alternative of Germans paying taxes to support and equip a European Army without contributing manpower has been rejected. Yet German conscripts wandering through the market places and marching

(Continued on page 23)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *The Indian Loses Again*

THE American Indians have suffered another grave loss, thanks to Commissioner Dillon S. Myer. Willard W. Beatty, who undertook in 1936 to direct Indian education, has resigned. He was the most outstanding man ever to fill that most important position. Highly educated, he was widely and favorably known in his profession. To him, the Indians, as fellow Americans, were entitled to the rights and privileges of citizens. He was zealous and intelligent in his service. However, when Commissioner Myer, running true to form, arbitrarily interfered with Mr. Beatty's expert administration, although he had no competence in educational matters, the former felt that he must resign. UNESCO has now made Mr. Beatty "Fundamental Education Deputy," and he will undoubtedly perform as well as he did among the Indians until a blundering and dictatorial tin-Hitler tossed a monkey wrench into a mechanism that he was not capable of understanding.

It is doubtful whether Mr. Myer will be able to replace Mr. Beatty with a man of equal ability and devotion. But that will not disturb him. He does not want men equal to their tasks, even if doubtful of his own omniscience and infallibility. Mr. Myer feels quite capable of telling specialists in fields in which he himself is uninformed, what to do and how to do it.

Before he accepted the Commissionership, Mr. Myer demanded the right to oust William Zimmerman Jr., the able Associate Commissioner, whom he probably misdoubted as being willing to abdicate his own more mature judgment to that of Commissioner Myer and the underling third-raters with whom he quickly surrounded himself. Quickly and ungraciously he sacrificed the experienced and competent Zimmerman. It meant nothing to him that Mr. Zimmerman was widely known to Indians throughout the country. They trusted him as a friend and sought his advice. Courteous, able, experienced and understanding, he was too valuable a man to be let out.

This was the first, but unfortunately not the last, indication that Myer intended to transform the Bureau of Indian Affairs into a puppet show, with him pulling the strings. To replace the valuable Zimmerman he brought in H. Rex Lee, who feels perfectly at ease in a puppet show. He has been known in the Department of the Interior as a man who has a low opinion of Indians, which, if true, would qualify him, in Mr. Myer's mind, for the position in the Bureau next only to his own. Other appointees to positions close to Mr. Myer's papier-mâché throne were also without experience or known interest in Indian Affairs.

Besides Mr. Zimmerman, others have been persuaded by circumstances, or forced, to walk the plank, despite their general interest in the Indians. About a year ago Senator McCarran, who loves dictators, if they are Fascists or Indian Commissioners, demanded the transfer of E. R. Fryer, Superintendent of the Paiute Reservation in Nevada. Eager to oblige such a potent enemy of the Indians, Commissioner Myer promptly issued an order transferring Fryer to the state of Washington. When the White House learned of this, an order was issued to hold up the transfer. Fryer's fault had been that he had been too considerate of and assiduous in his service to the Indians, whose lands and water rights Franco's friend wanted to grab for white constituents. Fearful that Myer would get him, sooner or later, Fryer resigned to accept a better job with the ECA.

Some friends of the Indians have doubted whether Commissioner Myer had a sympathetic and understanding attitude toward the Indians. They should not feel this way. Myer is full of sympathy for his charges on occasion. There are even times when his indignation is aroused. Take the case of the late Sergeant, First Class, John R. Rice, a Winnebago Indian who had heroically given his life to his country in far-away Korea, and who, thanks to President Truman, was recently buried, with honors, in Arlington Cemetery. When Mrs. Rice was denied the right to bury her husband in the Memorial Park Cemetery of Sioux City, Iowa, the aroused Indian Commissioner sent a wire to her, telling her that this refusal was, in his opinion, "most deplorable."

With this attitude of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, all of the friends of the American Indians are, of course, in full accord. They go so far as to hope that, having brought himself to express some regard for the dignity and rights of an Indian killed in fighting for his country, the Commissioner, if given enough time, may come to have some respect for the dignity and the rights of the Indians who are still alive and for whom he can do much more than the cemetery of Sioux City, Iowa, could have done for Sergeant Rice and his greatly bereaved wife and mother. After all, Sergeant Rice did not give his life for the white citizens of America, but for all of us, regardless of race or creed.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

CANADA: THE PROBLEMS OF CULTURAL SOVEREIGNTY

by C. Hartley Grattan

NATIONS, like individuals, usually prefer that strangers attend to them when they are counting their blessings and look the other way when it is their shortcomings that are being reviewed. But when the Canadians publish such a remarkable pair of books as the Royal Commission Report and the accompanying volume of "studies," listed below, one may be forgiven for taking the opportunity to discuss their cultural predicament—not only because it is interesting in itself, but because its implications reach far beyond Canada. The arts, letters and sciences are everywhere in something of a predicament and the Canadian variant is but one example.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES (The King's Printer, Ottawa, Canada; $3.50).

ROYAL COMMISSION STUDIES (The King's Printer, Ottawa, Canada; $3).

CANADA'S CENTURY, by D. M. Lebourdais (Methuen, Toronto, Canada; $4).

The Canadians aspire, and have for many years aspired, to establish and maintain a cultural identity that will make them one of the world's distinctive people. As members of a nation that enjoys political autonomy within the British Commonwealth, the ties and associations of the Canadians with the United Kingdom are strong. But because they occupy a large, rich and underdeveloped segment of North America, in the development of which they have always had more extensive financial assistance from the United States than from any other country; and because their history has, since the American Revolution at least, been deeply affected in every realm of their national life by influence from below the border, the Canadians have emerged as an *American* people. Thus "being a Canadian" is, in one of its vital aspects, a matter of maintaining a subtle and often uneasy balance between British loyalties and sensitive response to American influences.

But there is more to it than that. Canadian culture exhibits two branches, one deriving from British roots and still drawing sustenance from Britain, while undergoing continuous influence from the United States; the other deriving from French roots, still drawing sustenance from France, but less influenced by the United States. Anything truly "national" in Canadian life must, therefore, somehow combine and transcend the values implicit in those two backgrounds. This must be done while maintaining reasonable independence of the United Kingdom and the United States. As matters stand in the mid-twentieth century, it is the danger of being swallowed up by the United States, culturally speaking, that exercises most alert Canadian minds, including those of Chairman Vincent Massey and his Royal Commissioners. Worse fates can be imagined, but the hard fact remains that disappearance into the American maw means the end of even the aspiration to Canadian-ness.

And even so, the Canadian culture-problem is not fully defined. Despite the fact that Europeans have been in Canada for more than four hundred years, Canada is a "new" country. As a unity, sea to sea, it is but a recent conception, imperfectly realized. When this unity became imaginable is hard to say, perhaps in 1886 when the first Canadian Pacific train ran from Montreal to Vancouver. Certainly 1867, the date of confederation, is too early. My grandfather, who was born in 1843, never to the end of his long life in Nova Scotia meant anything more by "Canada" than the St. Lawrence River country. Setting aside its special difficulties, a nation as new as that cannot be expected to have the cohesiveness of an older community. Often the Royal Commissioners refer to the exasperations arising from the great distances of Canada and the associated thinness of settlement. Although the population is growing—when I was first taken there in 1903 it was about 6 million; today it exceeds 14 million—and is now more than half urban, the growth is not at a pace which promises to fill the great open spaces, and there is small indication that this will ever be done. Even so great an optimist as D. M. Lebourdais, who outlines Canada's remarkable resource potentialities with undisciplined enthusiasm, does not forecast any such development. As far ahead as one can see, those who worry about Canadian culture will have to worry about the difficulties caused by the dispersion of people over a huge area of land, people engaged in farming, lumbering, mineral extraction, manufacturing, and service occupations. Even the growth of manufacturing towns and cities will not solve much; it will simply create the problem of establishing some sort of creative relation between industrial man and our inherited culture.

Meanwhile where do the Canadians stand? The *Report* and the *Studies* provide full but apparently not exhaustive information about Canada's cultural institutions, though nothing much about cultured Canadians. One must assume that they exist in fair numbers or these volumes would not have been conceived and compiled. Canadian science is middling to brilliant and very decently organized and patronized. The humanities are in a bad way, neglected by a people that has thus far preferred science and technology. As to the institutional framework, Canada has, for example, 32 universities, all of which need more endowment, or current income, or both.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The country has only four first-class resident orchestras, but is well served with visiting concert artists and "it is possible that there are now in Canada more private collections of good records than of good books," a situation attributable to the influence of the government-operated broadcasting system. However, Canadian composers and concert artists have a hard time getting a hearing. There is no adequate library of music in Canada. The theatre, for the greater part in the hands of amateurs, seems reasonably lively, but is atrociously housed. *Housing* the arts is one of Canada's great problems. The ballet has established a precarious footing. Painting, it is alleged, is farther advanced than literature. The National Gallery is fair; provincial galleries in a sad way. Films come mostly from Hollywood, but some excellent Canadian documentaries have been made. Sculpture exists but awaits patrons.

Canadian architecture exhibits the "worst excesses of nineteenth century eclecticism," and town-planning is still mostly in unread books. There is no national herbarium and no national aquarium. The public-library system is haphazard in its coverage and there is no National Library at all, Canada being the only country in the world to lack one. Worse still, "The three best collections [of Canadiana] in the world are now in the United States, in the Library of Congress, in the New York Public Library and in the Library of Harvard University." The national archives need overhauling, with special attention to the period since 1867. A Historical Museum would be worthwhile. Scholarly societies usually have ludicrously small budgets and correspondingly meager activities. Canadians have written "a few good books and not a single great one." It is hard to get Canadian books published in Canada. Canadians read, in English, three English or American books to one Canadian. They read their own newspapers mostly, but they read more foreign magazines (chiefly American) than Canadian magazines. No Canadian newspaper or magazine transcends the language line; there is little translating from English to French, or vice versa.

The underlying difficulty is rooted in that little understood subject, the economics of culture. Here are two quotes:

> No novelist, poet, short story writer, historian, biographer, or other writer of non-technical books can make even a modestly comfortable living by selling his work in Canada.
>
> No composer of music can live at all on what Canada pays him for his compositions.
>
> Apart from radio drama, no playwright and only a few actors and producers can live by working in the theatre in Canada.
>
> Few painters and sculptors, outside the fields of commercial art and teaching, can live by sale of their work in Canada. – *Quoted from Arts Council brief, Report.*

> But the institutions . . . suffer in common from lack of nourishment. . . . It seems to us that two things are essential to restore in Canada the balance between the attention we pay to material achievements and to the other less tangible but more enduring parts of our civilization. The first must be of course the will of our people to enrich and to quicken their cultural and intellectual life. . . . The second essential is money. – *Report.*

Because Canadians in academic life have at least some income, and a little leisure, Canadian literature seems to be passing into their hands. So also Canadian painting. Talented Canadians migrate abroad, presumably some to Britain, but mostly to the United States. The export of talent from Canada is an old trade. Symbolically, Chairman Massey's brother Raymond is a Canadian export to the American stage.

But is the Canadian situation unique? Compare it with Australia, another dominion, or with the United States or the United Kingdom. Australia also has a small population, half of it widely dispersed. It too has a culture-problem, at the levels both of the individual and the institution. True, it has kept its Australiana collections at home—libraries like the Mitchell in Sydney are a great credit—but it has only begun to develop a public-library system. Its national literature is more highly developed than Canada's, its painters have a longer tradition; but writers and artists who make a living from their art are rare birds. The theatre is mostly in the hands of amateurs; the best magazines are kept alive by subsidies. Australia exports talent in quantity, especially to Britain. A good many Australian books are published, though with difficulty, and books are imported in great quantities, mostly from Britain. Australia gets American money for cultural purposes, but being far away does not feel the full American impact. However, in spite of the distance, it is within the British culture-system more solidly than Canada and its independence must also, to an extent, be self-consciously maintained. All in all, Australians cannot look down their noses at Canadians.

Nor do I think the Americans are in better position to practise this exercise. We appear to pour out money for cultural purposes, but all our universities are having income troubles; our public-library system is weak precisely where the Canadian is weakest, in areas of dispersed population; the theatre outside New York is largely an amateur enterprise; music is kept alive by cap-in-hand solicitation of funds; we must scratch around to find good films to see; and as a group our creative people are economically shaky. I lately saw quoted a figure of "less than $3,000" as the average annual income of American writers; that's worse than public-school teachers, acknowledged to be a depressed group. Actors, I learn, averaged $840 for their work in the theatre for the year ending July 1, 1950. The moans out of England, where the traditional economic foundations of the arts have crumbled, I shall simply recall but not document. The gist of the matter, I think, is that while the context of Canada's "culture-crisis" is only correctly to be defined in Canadian terms, the basic economic crisis of culture, which it is also and simultaneously suffering, runs its turgid course throughout all the Western world. This the Royal Commissioners seem not clearly to recognize.

Peppered through the *Report* are references to grants to Canadian cultural enterprises from the great American foundations, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Guggenheim, Ford. While the Royal Commissioners are of the opinion that these grants have given Canada much she would not otherwise have enjoyed, they also suggest that Canada has leaned too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

readily and too heavily on American generosity in the past and ought now to pay more of her own bills. Recognizing that the American foundations have helped Canadians to be Canadians, and have not indulged in "cultural imperialism," there is nevertheless a feeling of uneasiness about the free flow of American money. Since there is small hope of Canadian private fortunes being converted into foundation endowments, the only course open is to cut culture in on the public purse. The Commissioners propose to do this in various ways, but it would be pointless to detail the suggestions here. Mention should be made, however, of the proposed Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences to handle tax funds allocated and to balance the already operating National Research Council which deals with the natural sciences. The Canada Council is a composite of the ideas behind the Arts Council of Great Britain and the British Council on the one hand, and the American-style foundation on the other.

Without wishing to depreciate such an enterprise, I wonder if the Commissioners recognized fully the import of a remark by one of their French Canadian advisers, *"Une littérature nationale n'est pas le résultat de manoeuvres artificielles."* Extend that to all the arts, letters and sciences and it is still true. Forgetting the spiritual katzenjammers from which men of culture periodically suffer in new, old, rich and poor countries, the underlying problem of cultural production and conservation is a problem in the economics of culture. If we knew something about that intricate matter, perhaps we could figure out a truly wise way to satisfy the lifelong and extremely various needs of those odd fish, the artists, and the requirements of the necessary cultural institutions as well. Thus with discrimination and aplomb we might satisfy the aspirations of those restless people who think that to a decent material standard of living a distinctive national culture should be added and that more than a pittance should be set aside for those who provide, promote and cherish it. How, really, does and should a nation properly pay for its culture? What does one do to keep grants from becoming *"manoeuvres artificielles"*?

C. Hartley Grattan is the first American-born member of a family with roots in Canada that run back about a century and a half.

MAN AND MEDICINE

A HISTORY OF MEDICINE, by Henry E. Sigerist. Vol. I: Primitive and Archaic Medicine. Publication No. 27, Historical Library, Yale Medical Library (Oxford University Press; $8.50).

THE BOOK here reviewed is the first of a projected series of eight volumes on the history of medicine which Henry E. Sigerist has retired to Switzerland to prepare, on the basis of the studies of a lifetime. It is encyclopedic in scope and specialists in particular fields may differ with regard to the significance of, say, some special ceremony in a particular Indian tribe. On the whole, however, there can be no question of the soundness of the conclusions drawn, and each chapter is provided with exhaustive references.

The first two-fifths of the volume is devoted to a broad and illuminating discussion of the basic principles involved, of the problems and methods of medical history, of the incidence of disease in time and space, of primitive medicine, attitudes toward the sick, and the place of the "medicine man" in the more primitive civilizations. Sigerist demonstrates that "there are no sharp borderlines and that in the mind of primitive man, magic, religion, and medicine constitute an inseparable whole." He points out that "it is an insult to the medicine man to call him the ancestor of the modern physician. He is that, to be sure, but he is much more, namely the ancestor of most of our professions." And it is fascinating to see how in the primitive arts of healing, the application of empirical science often played a part, as in the discovery of inoculation against smallpox, introduced with the backing of Cotton Mather in Boston in 1716, as a result of information received from one of his Negro slaves.

The last three-fifths of the book is devoted to the development of medicine in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. Sigerist gives us a brief but vivid description of the geographical setting of each of those two great civilizations, of their social and economic conditions, their labor and recreation. In Egypt the scientific element looms large in the empirical-religious-magical art of healing. At the very dawn of history we find two theoretical treatises dealing crudely but with considerable acumen with the basic principles of physiology and pathology. In Mesopotamia, the religious and magical elements were stronger. It is understood that the next book will present a somewhat similar contrasting picture of ancient medical thinking in India and Greece.

Judged from its first volume, Sigerist's work will interest a circle much wider than the medical profession. It is *about* medicine; but it *is* history. It is a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the human mind and the ways in which that mind functions in the creation of a social order.

C.-E. A. WINSLOW

C.-E. A. Winslow, Professor Emeritus of Public Health, Yale University, is the editor of the American Journal of Public Health and author of many books on public health.

THE PLACE OF GERMANY

THE POLITICAL COLLAPSE OF EUROPE, by Hajo Holborn (Knopf; $2.50).

HAJO HOLBORN, professor of History at Yale, presents in this excellent little book a summary of the political history of modern Europe from 1815 to the present day. He devotes three-fourths of his space to the developments since 1914; especially good is the discussion of the period between the two wars. Germany was from the beginning determined to demand a radical revision of the Paris settlement in her favor, and as she grew stronger—and her recovery was rapid despite the settlement—she set her heart on forcing a full reversal of the historic decisions of World War I. It was this determination that rallied German opinion more and more to National Socialism.

Britain and France had then no conception of a European political system in which Germany could have full

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equality without being able to dominate. But there is the question whether full equality for Germany can ever be possible without the risk of German supremacy, at least as long as there is no change of heart in Germany, of which there was not even a beginning after 1918. Perhaps today, and as long as the United States, Britain and France maintain the closest unity, the chances for such an integration of Germany into a Western system are better. However, an observer cannot fail to be anxious about the future of Germany and of Europe when he finds that many responsible Germans expect their country to become America's junior partner in running Europe and the Western world to the detriment of France and Britain. A better Germany and a better Europe are not to be obtained through a German-French rapprochement but through the growth in Germany of a conviction that the policy followed between the two wars cannot be repeated, that no wedge can be driven into the unity of France, England and the United States on which the security of the world and the development of a peaceful Germany depend.

HANS KOHN

FICTION PARADE

THE UNQUIET NIGHT, by Albrecht Goes (Houghton Mifflin; $2.25).

THE MANGO ON THE MANGO TREE, by David Mathew (Knopf; $3).

ALBRECHT GOES is a German pastor and former Wehrmacht chaplain. David Mathew is the titular Archbishop of Apamea in Africa. The fact that both authors are of the cloth might suggest a comparison between their novels. Actually it would be difficult to find two more dissimilar books.

The Unquiet Night is a long, inconclusive short story in drab, unleavened prose, marked by a depressing naiveté—literary, psychological and even moral. The year is 1942. In a rear-area Ukrainian town a Wehrmacht chaplain is assigned to offer what personal and religious solace he can to a condemned deserter. While the chaplain studies the deserter's record during the night preceding the execution, his billet is shared by another, in effect, condemned man—Captain Brentano, assigned to the Stalingrad front. And the captain's bed, in turn, is shared by his fiancée, Melanie, a nurse. The possibilities here are certainly arresting and the mere presentation of the situation creates an air of novelistic excitement. The author's inability to deliver what the story promises is therefore doubly disappointing. The deserter goes to the firing squad with, the chaplain fatuously implies, new-found courage and ability to love in his heart; Brentano, considerably more solaced, it is to be hoped, by his sweetheart's embrace, takes off for Stalingrad; the padre returns to his home station. In the sermonical conclusion the daring half-hope is expressed that the lovers' unsanctified union may be blessed with issue. Life, you see, goes on. A novel may reasonably be expected to say more about life than that.

Readers hoping for some insight into the effect of Hitler's regime on the *good* people in Germany will find that they were by turn fretful and depressed, and above all helpless. As good Christians they knew that salvation lay in Hitler's defeat. As good Germans they did their best to forestall that defeat. Guilt there is, but nowhere is the *taste* of guilt suggested, and the chaplain almost seems to find absolution in his helplessness.

Le Ciel de Normandie is winging southward uneventfully toward Khartoum with an international passenger list of eleven—the opening of a tale of high intrigue? Far from it. The Skymaster lands, takes off, is quietly forced down by engine trouble, quietly repaired, leaves passengers at Gondokoro airport, takes off for Kenya, returns, takes off for the Gold Coast, etc. In fact, the smidgen of plot in *The Mango on the Mango Tree* is largely supplied by the coming and going of planes. The passengers for the most part are enervated foreigners hypersensitive to national distinctions, or foreign-educated natives nervously anticipating humiliation. On the ground or in the air they regard each other with detachment or fastidious aversion—words like *bored*, *tiring*, *dislike* and *irritable* receive heavy usage—and the author's interest obviously lies in the discrete minds of his characters. Their thoughts are often provocative, unintentionally funny, or learned, for Archbishop Mathew's intelligence is both mordant and nimble, and deeply cultured.

In other words, there are many "good things" in this book. One wonders, however, whether it would be worth the trouble to dig them out were it not for a really solid achievement: the many-sided representation of the Middle African scene, from Kenya to the Gold Coast, and particularly the malarial effect of colonialism. Most of the white characters have this in common: their return passage to Europe at the conclusion of their employment has been guaranteed. Now that a net of airlines and fields has been flung over Africa, her captors seem more rootless than ever. (The natives, miserable in other ways, are at least going home.) The atmosphere of alienation—alienation from other human beings, from the continent, from all but the past—is suavely created and raises the novel above the level of cleverness. *The Mango on the Mango Tree* is puckery fruit but not unappetizing.

DAVID GOLDKNOPF

MOVIES

Stephen Crane in 1951

IT IS EASY to say of John Huston's production of *The Red Badge of Courage* that it is a pictorially striking, often quite beautiful picture; beyond that it is not at all easy to know what to say.

Stephen Crane's novel presents formidable problems for the dramatic adapter. In the first place, and despite the violent, multitudinous events it records, the true action of the story occurs within the mind of the youth, Henry Fleming. The heart of the book is a long interior monologue, and that is not readily staged (particularly with the inexperienced and impassive Audie Murphy in the role). Nor do you escape the difficulty by having passages—well selected, to be sure—from Crane's text read by a commentator.

Second, Crane's dialogue is not the best side of his art. His instinct for realism, his wish to make books talk as men talk, was sounder than his ear, and the conversations of his soldiers are not only antique; they are often preposterous. Furthermore, Murphy and his partner in this film, Bill Mauldin, are so obviously unwilling to believe in oaths like "by the eternal thunders" and "gee rod" that their lines fall cold at their feet. The more experienced members of their supporting cast, John Dierkes and Andy Devine in particular, handle their improbable speeches a good deal better, but it is still hapless dialogue.

There remains, finally, the problem of projecting the moral struggle and the moral victory onto the screen. Why did the youth who fled in panic yesterday, return today a possessed and inspiring hero? Was it merely possession, a hysteria induced by shame and despera-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and exhaustion? That is what it looks to be in this picture, but surely that is not what Crane meant. "He had been to touch the great death and found that, after all, it was but the great death." Or as writers have been saying ever since Crane, it is the fear of fear that makes us cowards.

The change in the youth is a thing you can experience from the novel, for you not only see what he sees but know what the sights are doing to him: Crane and his hero were very close and the reader partakes of that intimacy. But on the screen, Henry is a distant and tragic figure, first running, crazed, away from battle and then running, still crazed, into battle. The direction of flight seems immaterial; the fact that he survives seems ridiculous. And the voice reciting Crane is not much assistance—you cannot listen to prose, even beautiful prose, as you watch men leap and scream and die in torment.

It strikes me that Huston saw all these problems and attempted to escape them by making a tapestry of *The Red Badge*. It is a film of exquisitely heightened reality, so clear, so detailed, so lovingly designed that it looks again and again like a series of Civil War engravings brought magically to life. If you think of Huston's movie as a sort of dance-poem inspired by *The Red Badge* and if you come to it fresh enough from a reading of the book to remember what the youth felt as the noise and terror and pain swept toward him, engulfed him and finally receded and left him whole, the production may be an exciting experience. But as a dramatization of the novel in any sense of being its equivalent, it is baffling, often unconvincing, in the end unsatisfying.

Whether or not *Here Comes the Groom* is what the public wants from Bing Crosby it is what, again and again, it gets. Until we revolt by tearing up the seats of the theatre, or at least refusing to occupy them, it is what we will presumably continue to get. Some tasteless slapstick, an old slouch hat, a soulful moment or two at the piano, two or three fairish songs sung with mechanical ease, a comic dance with incongruous props, a plot dripping with love for little children, and in the end the arms of a lovely girl who looks too young to remember the Crosby charm. This time Jane Wyman, Franchot Tone and Alexis Smith share in the jaded rites and pretend that it is great fun to appear with a star whose mind seems to be on his other enterprises. Not that you can blame Crosby; there isn't much use plugging a Kiwanis frolic as though it were *Guys and Dolls*.

People Will Talk, from a play called *Dr. Praetorius*, sets down some happenings in the life of a physician whom only an ingrate with a gift for understatement would call the brightest star of his profession and an inspiration to the human race. This Aesculapian paragon, otherwise Cary Grant, is a miraculous healer, a spiritual adviser of purest metal, an inspired musician (leads an orchestra of adoring amateurs), an exquisitely delicate lover (it is upon this gallant delicacy that the queasy plot revolves). He also plays with model trains and is an acknowledged connoisseur of German sausage and beer. His girl is Jeanne Crain; his best friend is Walter Slezak; his man Friday, about whose stiff neck there is quite a tale, is Finlay Currie, late Highland gillie to Queen Victoria. Any one of these—or all three of them together—would gladly die for Dr. P; he loves them to the point of hypnosis.

On the other hand, the doctor's enemy is Hume Cronyn, who plays Professor Elwell, a sneaky, querulous, jealous little rabbit of a man whose mean-spirited plot to discredit the hero is blown to shreds in a hurricane of indignation and scornful laughter. The professor is my man; he's a crabbed little fellow, no doubt, but I share his distaste for supermen, particularly supermen with cleft chins and a way of treating all females from 18 to 80 like naughty little girls.

This movie is the least appetizing of the Zanuck-Mankiewicz epics of sophistication. It has come out all gluey.

ROBERT HATCH

FREE EXAMINATION OFFER

on the famous Manchester Guardian

• *"The Guardian is far more important than its circulation indicates . . . it is known and read throughout the world."*
—N. Y. Times.

• *"Unquestionably, one of the world's half-dozen great newspapers."*
—Time Magazine.

YOU ARE INVITED to read the next four issues of the *Manchester Guardian*, weekly air edition, at our risk. This famous publication brings you a *fresh viewpoint* on British and international affairs—especially on the confusing questions of Korea, East vs. West, and the internal situation in England today. The *Guardian* is fearless, honest, liberal. It will stimulate your thinking as it does for the great opinion makers throughout the world who read it regularly. Accept this free-examination offer by mailing the coupon with your check today. Money back if not delighted. Manchester Guardian, 53 East 51 Street, New York 22.

Mail Coupon For Special Free Offer

THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN R4
53 East 51 Street, New York 22, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription to the *Manchester Guardian*, Weekly Air Edition, as checked below. If not satisfied after seeing the first four issues, I may cancel and get a full refund. My payment is enclosed.

☐ 1 year, $6.50 ☐ 20 weeks, $2

Name.....

Address.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSIC: Delayed Reaction

As its principal novelty of the fall season at the City Center, the New York City Ballet staged, for the first time in the United States, Béla Bartók's 32-year-old ballet *The Miraculous Mandarin*. Like Alban Berg's *Lulu* and Kurt Weill's *The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagony*, *The Miraculous Mandarin* is a specimen of the expressionist-realism of post-World War I Mitteleuropa; and like its depraved fellows, it is frequently discussed by cultural wiseacres but seldom performed. It is based on the cynical proposition that there is—for stage purposes, at least—no life like low life. The central characters are an ill-tempered prostitute and what Nicolas Slonimsky calls "an unquenchably libidinous mandarin," and the most active secondary figures are a gang of street toughs. The mandarin continues to make passes at the tart even after the boys have beaten him within a millimeter of his life. When no end to the piece is in sight, a touch of *Flying Dutchman* mysticism brings the curtain down. The mandarin's quarry, for reasons that are obscure, abruptly kisses him, and this fruition of his pursuit enables him to die placidly.

For all the period quality of its materials and its implicit denial that moral concepts have a place in the theatre, the ballet has potent qualities. Jean Rosenthal's lighting, quite as miraculous as the mandarin, and Alvin Colt's setting, a high platform with dizzy flights of stairs running in several irrational directions, establish a shady, neurotic mood that is gripping. Todd Bolender's choreography, though monotonously angry in dynamic level, supplies Melissa Hayden (wearing the paste-white face that is the professional mark of expressionist streetwalkers) and Hugh Laing with virtuoso materials, and both give projectile performances of supreme technical expertness.

Bartók's score, slow-moving and full of wrenching dissonances from melodic lines that grate against one another in different keys, is starkly effective, and its musical ideas sound far more daring than those of our genteel theatre composers in 1951. Its self-contained, almost orgiastic tonal ecstasy has little in common, however, with the agitated, sharply accented athleticism of Bolender's movement themes. In the 1920s (*The Miraculous Mandarin* was first produced in 1926) danced theatre-pieces of this kind were done largely in pantomime, with a stream of stylized action paralleling the stream of music but not necessarily coinciding with all its accents and phrase structures. Bolender's choreography is thus anachronistic; the production would have greater unity if he, like Colt and Miss Rosenthal, had understood and recaptured the expressionist idiom. Even so, this is one of the most interesting ballets we have been given in some time.

The reluctance of a subsequent generation to accept, or even listen to, the advanced music of the first part of this century was even more of a disappointment to Schönberg than to Bartók. But at least Schönberg lived to see an upswing in the fortunes of his works. In the very month in which he died last summer, both his Wind Quintet and his Concerto Grosso appeared on records—not because the record companies foresaw an opportunity to memorialize him, but because his music, and 12-tone music generally, is moving into the ascendancy as the influence of Stravinsky's chic neoclassicism fades away. The radical music written between 1910 and 1930 is still the most modern music there is. We are now ready to assimilate it, and the conventional output of today's lily-livered composers offers it little competition.

From his system of rearranging the 12 tones of the chromatic scale into arbitrary "rows," and submitting these rows to certain premeditated variations, Schönberg deservedly won recognition as the leading innovator of his time. The universal implications of his contribution to musical theory have tended, however, to deflect attention from his personal quality as a creative artist. Although the 12-tone method is susceptible to wide application by composers of all nationalities, Schönberg himself was not essentially an international composer. He spent the last 18 years of his life in this country, but his outlook—perhaps diminishingly—was essentially that of a Viennese. He considered himself the continuator of the local tradition of Brahms and Mahler. His emotional world was that of Austrian late romanticism and *alt Wien* (the Viennese waltz pervades many of his works), and he was not only unsympathetic to musical developments outside Central Europe but largely unacquainted with them. Schönberg was the great paradox of modern music: he gave intelligibility to a tremendous array of new resources and his system provides a basis for much of the forward-looking composition in America and Europe today, yet his heart remained in Vienna with the Mahler he knew in the years before 1912.

An equally sharp personality split could be observed in Artur Schnabel, who a few weeks later followed his old friend Schönberg in death. To concert audiences Schnabel was an intransigent pianist who refused either to traffic in cheap "audience appeal" or to challenge his hearers with new music, restricting his programs to Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and, now and again, Brahms. In his own estimation, however, his little-known career as a composer was more valuable than his world-famous piano-playing. His attitude as a composer was iconoclastic: a devotee of Schönberg's methods, he wrote hour-long pieces of such fearsome intellectual complexity that hardly anyone has played them and probably hardly anyone ever will. In a University of Chicago lecture entitled "Heart and Brain in Music," Schönberg once sought to define the proper relationship of these organs in the creative process. In his own music Schnabel did not find the right balance. For this reason we shall remember him for his playing of Beethoven and Schubert, in which, to a unique extent, he did.

CECIL SMITH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from page 15*)

through the streets of Germany can set in motion consequences without end. One is the reawakening of German militarism. A second is the growth of an uncontrolled fear in Russia, which otherwise realistic Soviet leaders may fall prey to, and which they are certain to exploit.

These dangers force the issue. European unity cannot be sacrificed on the altar of German neurosis. Nor can it be held up as the mask for German nationalism. If the Schuman Plan and the European Army are permitted to be no more than the façade for the re-creation of German industrial and military power they will be disasters. The insignia on the European uniform must symbolize a sovereign power deriving from a general consciousness, which German nationalism cannot by-pass or control.

Most young Germans understand this. The problem arises from the nature of the transition. The French Government maintains that Germany should be given equality within the framework of a European Union, that is, after its creation. The German Government in contrast wants equality now, and at each step along the way. Equality for an independent, sovereign Germany, says Carlo Schmid, is "an essential pre-condition for the foundation of a United Europe."

In time, given peace, Germany will achieve what Eisenhower called an "earned equality." Germany will belong to the NATO and SHAPE. And the capacity to wage war as a nation, now denied to Germany alone, will be denied to all members of a European Union.

Meanwhile there are clear limits to German independence and equality. No German will die for an occupation statute, said Schmid to all who wish to listen. But even in the replacement of the statute, by a contractual relationship, the allies will have to reserve final powers to station troops in Western Germany, to negotiate Germany's Eastern boundaries in a peace treaty, and to protect the Western sections of Berlin. Eventually, within the European Union, there will be no national general staffs, military academies, court-martial systems or independent armed forces. Meanwhile France, Belgium and the Netherlands have military commitments overseas which a European Army, in the absence of a political union, cannot take over.

In time, institutions will develop where these issues can be resolved according to established rules of law. Meanwhile it is necessary for individuals to assume these responsibilities. Germany's protest over France's right to maintain an independent general staff will be resolved by SHAPE. That is possible not because SHAPE as an institution has the necessary authority but because Eisenhower as an individual possesses the necessary prestige.

Eisenhower today is acting in many ways as the chief executive of Europe. He has been given powers which representative institutions alone should delegate because he symbolizes European unity and because he has persuaded Europeans that his purpose really is peace. His contribution is beyond praise. But the load he carries is far too heavy. No American mother would turn her son over to a general not subject to a Congress whose leaders she can help to elect. Why should a European mother act any differently?

Except through some personality, law may never come to life. But personality is no substitute for law. The problems which Eisenhower faces, he cannot resolve for an indeterminate future. They can be resolved only by making it clear that they are the problems of transition and that the transition is toward European Union as a clearly defined goal.

It is no longer enough simply to affirm this goal. Like recovery under the Marshall Plan, its key is an established timetable which requires open commitments and sets promise and performance side by side.

Yet institutions are not and cannot be ends in themselves. A timetable for federation will succeed only if federation is part of a broader program that adds up to a new life for Europe.

(This is the third in a series on Europe and the US. The last will deal with a new program for Europe.)

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

HOTEL
ROOSEVELT

A good address in the Nation's Capital, combining comfort and convenience. Transient and residential.

We make reservations for Hotel Lincoln in New York—another Maria Kramer Hotel.

from $4

WASHINGTON
D. C.

RESORTS

WINDY HILL
ON ORANGE LAKE
A pleasantly informal vacation in friendly atmosphere. Books, Records, Ping-pong, a two-mile lake for boating, fishing, swimming. Food of excellent quality in generous quantity. Rate $45 weekly, $7.50 daily
65 Miles From N. Y. C.
JANE C. ARENZ, R.D. No. 1, Walden, N. Y.
Phone: Newburgh 115 W 2

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

ROOM FOR RENT

MANHATTAN: Large, beautifully furnished room, adjoining bath in modern apartment. Call after 6. Tr. 7-8224.

LITERARY SERVICES

AUTHORS! Sales department available for your short stories, articles, books and plays. Free booklet. Write to-day! Mead Literary Agency, 419 4th Ave., New York 16, N. Y. (Or. 9-1150).

CLASSIFIED RATES

Per word (single insertion) ..... 12¢
Per word 6 times in one contract year.. 11¢
Per word 13 times in one contract year.. 10¢
Per word 26 times in one contract year.. 9¢

ADVERTISING DEPT.
New Republic 40 E. 49 St. N.Y.C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic *in the* CLASSROOM

For thirty-six years the *New Republic* has been used as a supplementary text in colleges and universities all over the United States.

Professors of Economics, History, Sociology and English have long recognized its value as a means of bringing the immediate present into the classroom.

In the *New Republic* the students meet mature minds that are neither cynical nor indifferent. They are brought face to face with ideas and problems that will shape their lives and to which they will make their own contributions. They come in contact with good writing and good reporting. They learn about significant books and writers, take part in discussions and controversies, and are kept abreast of proposals and plans for meeting the challenge of the future for which they are being prepared.

If you are a teacher will you please consider the *New Republic* for your classes this Fall Semester?

SPECIAL CLASSROOM RATES

Each student's copy costs 10¢ weekly (half the regular price) if ten or more are mailed to a single address. Free desk copies are included for each instructor. Orders may be placed for any number of weeks, even for one week only, if desired, or for the entire semester. Copies are mailed from Washington, D. C., on Tuesdays, two days before the *New Republic* appears on any newsstand. Students are assured of receiving the magazine while the news and topics are fresh and exciting.

Advance payment is not necessary. You need only fill out the order form provided below and send it to us. The bill will be sent later.

ORDER FORM

NEW REPUBLIC, 40 East 49 Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of the *New Republic* for ..... weeks beginning with the issue which will reach us about .....
@ 10¢ a copy (regularly 20¢). Payment will be made on receipt of your bill.

Name..... College or University.....

City..... Zone..... State..... 9/24/51

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED